arXiv:1510.04836v1 [math.AP] 16 Oct 2015

STABILITY AND ERROR ESTIMATES OF A GENERAL MODIFIED QUASI-BOUNDARY VALUE METHOD VIA A SEMI-LINEAR BACKWARD PARABOLIC EQUATION

VO ANH KHOA

Abstract. Regularization methods have been recently developed to construct stable approximate solutions to classical partial differential equations considered as final value problems. In this paper, we investigate the backward parabolic problem with locally Lipschitz source: $\partial_t u + \mu(t)\mathcal{A}u(t) = f(t,u)$ where $\mathcal{A}:\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})\subset\mathcal{H}\to\mathcal{H}$ is a positive, self-adjoint and unbounded linear operator on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. The problem arises in many applications, but it is in general ill-posed. The ill-posedness is caused by catastrophic growth in the representation of solution, then independence of solution on data makes computational procedures impossible. Therefore, we contribute to this interesting field the study of the stable approximation solution via the modified quasi-boundary value method based on nonlinear spectral theory, which slightly extends the results in many works. Our main focus is to qualitatively prove the stability and convergence rate where semi-group technicalities are highly useful.

1. Introduction

Let $\mathcal{H}$ be an abstract Hilbert space endowed with the inner product $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ and the norm $\|\cdot\|$. Let $\mathcal{A}:\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})\subset\mathcal{H}\to\mathcal{H}$ be a positive-definite self-adjoint unbounded linear operator such that $-\mathcal{A}$ generates a compact contraction semi-group on $\mathcal{H}$ and let $f:[0,T]\times\mathcal{H}\to\mathcal{H}$ for $T>0$. We consider the problem of finding a function $u:[0,T]\to\mathcal{H}$ such that

$$\begin{cases}\partial_t u + \mu(t)\mathcal{A}u(t) = f(t,u), \quad t\in(0,T),\\ u(T) = u_T.\end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

Our motivation is involved in many models where $\mathcal{A}=-\Delta$ is considered. For instance, taking $R(u)=u-u^2$ gives us the Fisher equation [8] that was originally used to describe the spreading of biological populations of diploid individuals living in a one-dimensional habitat while interpreting the reaction term as due to true births and deaths. One may also deduce another equations: the Newell-Whitehead-Segel equation [16] with $f(u)=u-u^3$ describes Rayleigh-Benard convection, and the Zeldovich equation [30] $f(u)=u^2-u^3$ performing the temperature in combustion theory. Additionally, it can be generalized into the Nagumo equation [15] with $f(u)=u(1-u)(u-C)$ for $C\in(0,1)$ modeling the transmission of electrical pulses in a nerve axon.

In principle, the problem (1.1) is well known to be severely ill-posed in the sense of Hadamard [9], which could be said that the solution (if it exists) does not depend continuously on the data in any reasonable topology. Therefore, we would like to contribute a stable approximation approach to deal with that obstacle.

In the past, many approaches have been studied for solving various kinds of the PDE in (1.1) and related problems, see [1, 2, 10, 11, 12, 14, 18, 20, 26, 29] and the references therein. We notably mention that over the last 20 years or so, the modified quasi-boundary method has developed step by step to maturity, allowing effective treatment of a broad range of linear problems backward in time. In fact, in

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35K05, 47A52, 62G08.

Key words and phrases. Modified quasi-boundary value method, Backward problems, Ill-posedness, Truncation, Stability, Error estimate.

the literature of such a method, it should be starting from the original establishment by Showalter *et al.* [19]. In that work, he introduced a way named quasi-boundary-value method to approximate the problem

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u + \mathcal{A}u(t) - \mathcal{B}u(t) = 0, \quad t \in (0,T), \\ u(0) = u_0, \end{cases}$$

by adding the final condition coupled with a factoring parameter $\alpha > 0$ small enough (i.e. $u(0) + \alpha u(T) = u_0$).

Inheriting from that idea, Clark and Oppenheimer [5] in 1994 perturbed the final condition $\alpha u(0) + u(T) = u_T$ to approximate the backward problem

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u + \mathcal{A}u(t) = 0, \quad t \in (0,T), \\ u(T) = u_T. \end{cases}$$

As a result, they obtained the well-posedness of the approximate nonlocal problem. Particularly, it can be proved that the stable approximate solution converges uniformly in time to the classical solution. There is also a well-known approach of perturbing the final observation in such a way that $u(T) - \alpha u'(0) = u_T$, proposed in [7] by Denche and Bessila within the framework of using a variant of that method to give an error estimate of logarithmic type at $t = 0$. In general, that result is better than the quasi-reversibility method.

In the literature on the non-homogeneous case, Denche *et al.* [6] gave extensions of the quasi-boundary methods while showing several sharp error estimates including explicit convergence rates. In particular, the authors constructed the stable approximate problem that generally perturbs both the source term f and the final value u_T by means of

$$f_\alpha = \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\lambda_p T}}{\alpha \lambda_p^k + e^{-\lambda_p T}} \langle f, \varphi_p \rangle \varphi_p, \quad u_T^\alpha = \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\lambda_p T}}{\alpha \lambda_p^k + e^{-\lambda_p T}} \langle u_T, \varphi_p \rangle \varphi_p,$$

where $\{\varphi_p\}_{p \in \mathbb{N}}$ is the set of orthonormal basis generated by the operator $\mathcal{A}$. Then each assumption on the data leads to a specific error estimate. For example, if $\|\mathcal{A}^s u_T\|^2 < \infty$ holds, the convergence rate is of order $\mathcal{O}(\ln^s(T/s\alpha))$.

The consideration of the specific problems in the non-homogeneous case is also in conjunction with the backward heat problem. Since 2008, the authors Trong and Tuan in [22] applied the method (generalized by Denche *et al.* [6] in 2012) to solve the problem,

$$\begin{cases} u_t - u_{xx} = f(x,t), & (x,t) \in (0,\pi) \times (0,T), \\ u(x,T) = g(x), & x \in (0,\pi), \\ u(0,t) = u(\pi,t) = 0, & t \in (0,T). \end{cases}$$

It thus comes out the approximate problem

$$\begin{cases} u_t - u_{xx} = \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-Tp^2}}{\varepsilon p^2 + e^{-Tp^2}} f_p(t) \sin(px), & (x,t) \in (0,\pi) \times (0,T), \\ u(x,T) = \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-Tp^2}}{\varepsilon p^2 + e^{-Tp^2}} g_p \sin(px), & x \in (0,\pi), \\ u(0,t) = u(\pi,t) = 0, & t \in (0,T), \end{cases}$$

where $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$ represents the error induced by measurement, and f_p, g_p are, respectively, defined by the inner product between f, g and $\sin(px)$ over $L^2(0,\pi)$.

The development of regularization methods has also set the stage for addressing more difficult problems with more challenging features. As far as we know, the regularization approaches concerning problems which contain nonlinear source term are, up to now, still limited though that problem has

a great position in many types of application ([13, 31]). In recent works, this theme has been tackled with source terms where they are globally Lipschitzian (*e.g.* [25]) or locally Lipschitzian with a special form (Tuan *et al.* [28]). Moreover, we observe that most of the previous works in this field did not take care of the time-dependent diffusion much, especially our problem (1.1). To our knowledge, the literature on such a problem is eventually narrow, and as might be expected, only two papers currently fulfilled related problems (see, [20, 26]). Motivated by those things, it is thus natural to raise the following question. Whether the modified quasi-boundary method based on [6] to (1.1) still works? As a result, this paper marks an extensive foray towards the development of numerical methods based on nonlinear spectral theory. Hence, the purpose of this generalization here is to attain general degrees of convergence while claiming that the method is successfully applicable to our problem.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. At first, for ease of the reading, we summarize in Section 2 some rudiments in semi-group of operators and elementary results. In addition, we present the formal solution of (1.1) leading to the state of ill-posedness in accordance with the construction of the regularized solution. We then obtain in Section 3 well-posedness and convergence result. In the last section, some concluding remarks are mentioned.

2. Preliminaries

We below present the functional settings together with notations, which will be used in this paper. Afterwards, we derive the representation of exact solution, and construct the regularized solution from those materials. Such elementary materials and further details can be found in [2, 17]. Therefore, we only list them and the results are presented while skipping the proofs.

We denote by $\{E_\lambda, \lambda > 0\}$ the spectral resolution of the identify associated to $\mathcal{A}$. Let us denote

$$\mathcal{S}(t) = e^{-t\mathcal{A}} = \int_0^\infty e^{-t\lambda} dE_\lambda \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}), \quad t \geq 0,$$

the C_0 semi-group of contractions generated by $-\mathcal{A}$ where $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ stands for the Banach algebra of bounded linear operators on $\mathcal{H}$. Then, we define

$$\mathcal{A}u := \int_0^\infty \lambda dE_\lambda u, \tag{2.1}$$

for all $u \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$. In this connection, $u \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$ if and only if the integral (2.1) exists, i.e.,

$$\int_0^\infty \lambda^2 d \|E_\lambda u\|^2 < \infty.$$

For this family of operators $\{\mathcal{S}(t)\}_{t\geq 0}$, we have:

(1) $\|\mathcal{S}(t)\| \leq 1$ for all $t \geq 0$;
(2) the function $t \mapsto \mathcal{S}(t), t \geq 0$ is analytic;
(3) for every real $r \geq 0$ and $t > 0$, the operator $\mathcal{S}(t) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}^r))$;
(4) for every integer $k \geq 0$ and $t > 0$, $\left\|\mathcal{S}^k(t)\right\| = \left\|\mathcal{A}^k \mathcal{S}(t)\right\| \leq c(k)\, t^{-k}$;
(5) for every $x \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}^r), r \geq 0$, we have $\mathcal{S}(t)\mathcal{A}^r x = \mathcal{A}^r \mathcal{S}(t) x$.

Definition 1. Let $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathcal{H}$ be a piecewise continuous function, we set

$$\mathcal{D}(f(\mathcal{A})) := \left\{ u \in \mathcal{H} : \int_0^\infty |f(\lambda)|^2 d \|E_\lambda u\|^2 < \infty \right\},$$

and define the operator $f(\mathcal{A}) : \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}) \subset \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$ by the formula

$$f(\mathcal{A})\, u := \int_0^\infty f(\lambda)\, dE_\lambda u,$$

for all $u \in \mathcal{D}(f(\mathcal{A}))$.

In this work, we assume:

(A_1) $u_T \in \mathcal{H}$ the given final state of observation;

(A_2) $\mu : [0,T] \to \mathbb{R}$ is differentiable, plays a role as time-dependent function such that there exists $0 < p \leq q$, $\mu(t) \in [p,q]$ for all $t \in [0,T]$;

(A_3) there exists a function, denoted by u_T^δ, depending on $\mathcal{H}$ satisfies $\left\|u_T^\delta - u_T\right\| \leq \delta$ for $\delta \in (0,1)$ representing a bound on measurement errors;

(A_4) there is a positive constant $C_R < \infty$ defined by

$$C_R := \sup\left\{\left|\frac{f(t,u) - f(t,v)}{u - v}\right| : |u|, |v| \leq R, u \neq v, t \in [0,T]\right\},$$

then C_R is a non-decreasing function of R and

$$|f(t,u) - f(t,v)| \leq C_R |u - v|,$$

for every $R > 0$, $|u|, |v| \leq R$ and $t \in [0,T]$.

Now we are ready to state the representation of exact solution of (1.1). Assume that the problem (1.1) admits a unique solution, then this solution can be represented by

$$u(t) = \mathcal{S}^{-1}(\bar{\mu}(t,T)) u_T - \int_t^T \mathcal{S}(\bar{\mu}(s,t)) f(s,u)\, ds, \tag{2.2}$$

where the function $\bar{\mu}$ is defined by

$$\bar{\mu}(a,b) := \int_a^b \mu(s)\, ds, \quad 0 \leq a \leq b \leq T.$$

Remark 2. The inverse operator $\mathcal{S}^{-1}(t)$ of $\mathcal{S}(t)$ can be defined for every $t > 0$ since $\mathcal{S}(t)$ is self-adjoint and one-to-one with range dense, i.e. $\mathcal{S}(t) = \mathcal{S}^*(t), \ker(\mathcal{S}(t)) = \{0\}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{S}(t))} = \mathcal{H}$. Thus, the inverse operator is $\mathcal{S}^{-1}(t) = e^{t\mathcal{A}}$. Furthermore, since the semi-group $\mathcal{S}(t)$ is analytic with the following property

$$\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{S}(t)) \subset \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}^n) \subset \mathcal{H}, \quad t \in (0,T],$$

and coupling with $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{S}(t)) \neq \overline{\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{S}(t))} = \mathcal{H}$, we state that $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{S}(t))$ is not closed. Therefore, the inverse operator is unbounded in $\mathcal{H}$ for $t \in (0,T]$. As a consequence, let us say that $\mathcal{S}^{-1}(\bar{\mu}(t,T)) = e^{\bar{\mu}(t,T)\mathcal{A}}$ and $\mathcal{S}(\bar{\mu}(s,t)) = e^{-\bar{\mu}(s,t)\mathcal{A}}$, then the representation of solution (2.2) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} u(t) &= e^{\bar{\mu}(t,T)\mathcal{A}} u_T - \int_t^T e^{-\bar{\mu}(s,t)\mathcal{A}} f(s)\, ds \\ &= \int_0^\infty e^{\bar{\mu}(t,T)\lambda} dE_\lambda u_T - \int_t^T \int_0^\infty e^{\bar{\mu}(t,s)\lambda} dE_\lambda f(s,u)\, ds. \end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

Now we can see that the rapid escalation of exponential functions, $e^{\bar{\mu}(t,T)\lambda}$ and $e^{\bar{\mu}(t,s)\lambda}$ for $t \leq s \leq T$, causes the ill-posedness of the problem, then performing classical calculation is definitely impossible. Therefore, contributing a regularization method is necessary to make the numerical computation possible.

On the one hand, for $R > 0$, we define the truncated function f_R such that

$$f_R(t,u) := \begin{cases} f(t,R), & u > R, \\ f(t,u), & |u| \leq R, \\ f(t,-R), & u < -R. \end{cases} \tag{2.4}$$

Then $f_R \in L^\infty([0,T]\times\mathbb{R})$ and it satisfies

$$|f_R(t,u) - f_R(t,v)| \le C_R|u-v|, \tag{2.5}$$

for all $u, v \in \mathbb{R}$ and $t \in [0,T]$.

On the other hand, we introduce a filtering function such that for each $\delta > 0$ and given $k \ge 1$ then $\Phi^\delta_{\bar\mu,\lambda} : [0,T]\times[0,T] \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfies

$$\Phi^\delta_{\bar\mu,\lambda}(s,t) := \frac{e^{(\bar\mu(t,s)-\bar\mu(0,T))\lambda}}{\delta\lambda^k + e^{-\bar\mu(0,T)\lambda}}, \quad 0 \le t \le s \le T. \tag{2.6}$$

Combining (2.4) and (2.6), and observe (2.3), the approximate solution, denoted by u^δ, corresponding to noise data can be deduced as follows:

$$u^\delta(t) := \int_0^\infty \Phi^\delta_{\bar\mu,\lambda}(T,t)\, dE_\lambda u^\delta_T - \int_t^T\int_0^\infty \Phi^\delta_{\bar\mu,\lambda}(s,t)\, dE_\lambda f_{R^\delta}\left(s,u^\delta\right) ds, \tag{2.7}$$

for $0 \le t \le T$. Here $R^\delta := R(\delta) > 0$ tends to infinity as $\delta \to 0^+$.

Now we shall prove some elementary inequalities to support our proofs in Section 3.

Lemma 3. *Given $k \ge 1$, let δ and M be positive constants, we have the following inequality*

$$\frac{1}{\delta x^k + e^{-Mx}} \le \frac{1}{\delta}\left(\frac{kM}{\ln\left(\frac{M^k}{k\delta}\right)}\right)^k, \quad x > 0.$$

Proof. Let us define $g(x) = \dfrac{1}{\delta x^k + e^{-Mx}}$, then taking its derivative implies

$$g'(x) = \frac{Me^{-Mx} - \delta k x^{k-1}}{\left(\delta x^k + e^{-Mx}\right)^2}. \tag{2.8}$$

The equation $g'(x) = 0$ gives a unique solution x_0 such that the numerator of the right-hand side of (2.8) vanishes at x_0, i.e. $x_0^{k-1}e^{Mx_0} = \dfrac{M}{k\delta}$. The function g thus achieves its maximum at $x = x_0$. It has also been shown that $e^{-Mx_0} = \dfrac{k\delta}{M}x_0^{k-1}$, so the function g can be bounded by the following

$$g(x) \le \frac{1}{\delta x_0^k + e^{-Mx_0}} \le \frac{1}{\delta x_0^k + \frac{k\delta}{M}x_0^{k-1}}. \tag{2.9}$$

On the other hand, one easily has by using the simple inequality $e^{Mx_0} \ge Mx_0$ that

$$\frac{M}{k\delta} \le x_0^{k-1}e^{Mx_0} \le \frac{1}{M^{k-1}}e^{(k-1)Mx_0}e^{Mx_0} \le \frac{1}{M^{k-1}}e^{kMx_0},$$

which leads to

$$x_0 \ge \frac{1}{kM}\ln\left(\frac{M^k}{k\delta}\right). \tag{2.10}$$

Combining (2.9) and (2.10), we obtain

$$g(x) \le \frac{1}{\delta x_0^k} \le \frac{1}{\delta}\left(\frac{kM}{\ln\left(\frac{M^k}{k\delta}\right)}\right)^k.$$

□

Lemma 4. *Given $k \geq 1$, let δ and M be two positive constants. Then for $0 \leq a \leq M$, the following inequality holds:*

$$\frac{e^{-ax}}{\delta x^k + e^{-Mx}} \leq (kM)^{k\left(1-\frac{a}{M}\right)} \delta^{\frac{a}{M}-1} \left(\ln\left(\frac{M^k}{k\delta}\right)\right)^{k\left(\frac{a}{M}-1\right)}, \quad x > 0.$$

Proof. Applying Lemma 3 and direct computations, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{e^{-ax}}{\delta x^k + e^{-Mx}} &= \frac{e^{-ax}}{\left(\delta x^k + e^{-Mx}\right)^{\frac{a}{M}} \left(\delta x^k + e^{-Mx}\right)^{1-\frac{a}{M}}} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\left(\delta x^k + e^{-Mx}\right)^{1-\frac{a}{M}}} \\
&\leq \left[(kM)^k \delta^{-1} \left(\ln\left(\frac{M^k}{k\delta}\right)^{-k}\right)\right]^{1-\frac{a}{M}} \\
&\leq (kM)^{k\left(1-\frac{a}{M}\right)} \delta^{\frac{a}{M}-1} \left(\ln\left(\frac{M^k}{k\delta}\right)\right)^{k\left(\frac{a}{M}-1\right)}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 5. *For $\delta > 0, k \geq 1$, the filtering function $\Phi^{\delta}_{\bar{\mu},\lambda}$ given by (2.6) can be bounded by*

$$\Phi^{\delta}_{\bar{\mu},\lambda}(s,t) \leq (kTq)^{\frac{kp(s-t)}{qT}} \delta^{\frac{p(t-s)}{qT}} \left(\ln\left(\frac{(Tq)^k}{k\delta}\right)\right)^{\frac{-kp(s-t)}{qT}}, \quad 0 \leq t \leq s \leq T.$$

Moreover, it leads to

$$\Phi^{\delta}_{\bar{\mu},\lambda}(T,t) \leq (kTq)^{\frac{kp(T-t)}{qT}} \delta^{\frac{p(t-T)}{qT}} \left(\ln\left(\frac{(Tq)^k}{k\delta}\right)\right)^{\frac{-kp(T-t)}{qT}}, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T.$$

Proof. The proof is straightforward due to the assumption (A_2) and replacing $x = \lambda, a = qT - p(s-t)$ and $M = Tq$ in Lemma 4. □

Remark 6. We now turn to introduce the abstract Gevrey class of functions of order $s > 0$ and index $\sigma > 0$, denoted by $\mathbb{G}^s_\sigma$, (see, *e.g.*, [3]) characterized as

$$\mathbb{G}^s_\sigma := \left\{ u \in \mathcal{H} : \int_0^\infty \lambda^s e^{2\sigma\lambda} d\left\|E_\lambda u\right\|^2 < \infty \right\},$$

equipped with the norm

$$\|u\|^2_{\mathbb{G}^s_\sigma} := \int_0^\infty \lambda^s e^{2\sigma\lambda} d\left\|E_\lambda u\right\|^2 < \infty.$$

Let us remind that the focusing point in this paper lies in considering the Laplacian, i.e. $\mathcal{A} = -\Delta$. Here, the abstract Gevrey class $\mathbb{G}^s_\sigma$ is defined as the space $\mathcal{D}\left((-\Delta)^{s/2} e^{\sigma(-\Delta)^{1/2}}\right)$, and thus meaningful with the inner product

$$\langle u, v\rangle_{\mathcal{D}\left((-\Delta)^{s/2} e^{\sigma(-\Delta)^{1/2}}\right)} := \left\langle (-\Delta)^{s/2} e^{\sigma(-\Delta)^{1/2}} u, (-\Delta)^{s/2} e^{\sigma(-\Delta)^{1/2}} v \right\rangle,$$

for $u, v \in \mathcal{D}\left((-\Delta)^{s/2} e^{\sigma(-\Delta)^{1/2}}\right)$. Therefore, $\mathbb{G}^s_\sigma$ is the Hilbert space.

3. Main results

Observe that the representation (2.7) of regularized solution is naturally an integral equation. So what we have to consider in this section are well-posedness of the equation and convergence results. In the former work, it is easy to prove the existence and uniqueness of such an integral equation. In fact, let us remark that Lemma 5 says the boundedness of the filtering function $\Phi^{\delta}_{\bar{\mu},\lambda}$, then with the aid of the fact that f_{R^δ} is globally Lipschitz by (2.5) we obtain the result by the well-known Banach fixed-point theorem. Thereby, we shall claim the lemma below without proof.

Lemma 7. *The integral equation $u^\delta(t) = \mathcal{G}\left(u^\delta\right)(t)$ where $\mathcal{G}$ maps from $C([0,T];\mathcal{H})$ into itself such that*

$$\mathcal{G}\left(u^\delta\right)(t) = \int_0^\infty \Phi^{\delta}_{\bar{\mu},\lambda}(T,t)\, dE_\lambda u^\delta_T - \int_t^T \int_0^\infty \Phi^{\delta}_{\bar{\mu},\lambda}(s,t)\, dE_\lambda f_{R^\delta}\left(s,u^\delta\right) ds, \tag{3.1}$$

has a unique solution $u^\delta \in C([0,T];\mathcal{H})$ for every $\delta > 0$.

Theorem 8. *If u^δ and v^δ are two solutions of problem (2.7) corresponding to the final observations u^δ_T and v^δ_T respectively, then for all $0 \le t < T$,*

$$\left\|u^\delta(t) - v^\delta(t)\right\| \le \sqrt{2}\delta^{\frac{p}{q}\left(\frac{t}{T}-1\right)} \left(\ln\left(\frac{(Tq)^k}{k\delta}\right)\right)^{-\frac{kp}{q}\left(1-\frac{t}{T}\right)} (kTq)^{\frac{kp}{q}\left(1-\frac{t}{T}\right)} exp\left(C^2_{R^\delta}(T-t)^2\right) \left\|u^\delta_T - v^\delta_T\right\|.$$

Proof. From (2.7) , one deduces that for all $0 \le t < T$,

$$\begin{aligned} d^\delta(t) &= u^\delta(t) - v^\delta(t) \\ &= \int_0^\infty \Phi^{\delta}_{\bar{\mu},\lambda}(T,t)\, dE_\lambda\left(u^\delta_T - v^\delta_T\right) - \int_0^\infty \int_t^T \Phi^{\delta}_{\bar{\mu},\lambda}(s,t)\, dE_\lambda\left(f_{R^\delta}\left(s,u^\delta\right) - f_{R^\delta}\left(s,v^\delta\right)\right) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemmas 5, the elementary inequality $(a+b)^2 \le 2(a^2+b^2)$ and the global Lipschitz of f_{R^δ} by (2.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\|d^\delta(t)\right\|^2 &\le 2\delta^{\frac{2p}{q}\left(\frac{t}{T}-1\right)} \left(\ln\left(\frac{(Tq)^k}{k\delta}\right)\right)^{-\frac{2kp}{q}\left(1-\frac{t}{T}\right)} (kTq)^{\frac{2kp}{q}\left(1-\frac{t}{T}\right)} \left\|u^\delta_T - v^\delta_T\right\|^2 + \\ &+ 2\delta^{\frac{2pt}{qT}} \left(\ln\left(\frac{(Tq)^k}{k\delta}\right)\right)^{\frac{2kpt}{qT}} (kTq)^{-\frac{2kpt}{qT}} C^2_{R^\delta}(T-t) \int_t^T \delta^{-\frac{2ps}{qT}} \left(\ln\left(\frac{(Tq)^k}{k\delta}\right)\right)^{-\frac{2pks}{qT}} (kTq)^{\frac{2kps}{qT}} \left\|d^\delta(s)\right\|^2 ds. \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

Multiplying (3.2) by $\delta^{-\frac{2pt}{qT}} \left(\ln\left(\frac{(Tq)^k}{k\delta}\right)\right)^{-\frac{2kpt}{qT}} (kTq)^{\frac{2kpt}{qT}}$ and putting

$$w(t) = \delta^{-\frac{pt}{qT}} \left(\ln\left(\frac{(Tq)^k}{k\delta}\right)\right)^{-\frac{kpt}{qT}} (kTq)^{\frac{kpt}{qT}} \left\|d^\delta(t)\right\|,$$

we have

$$w^2(t) \le 2\delta^{-\frac{2p}{q}} \left(\ln\left(\frac{(Tq)^k}{k\delta}\right)\right)^{-\frac{2kp}{q}} (kTq)^{\frac{2kp}{q}} \left\|u^\delta_T - v^\delta_T\right\|^2 + 2C^2_{R^\delta}(T-t) \int_t^T w^2(s)\, ds.$$

Thanks to Grönwall's inequality, we obtain

$$w^2(t) \leq 2\delta^{-\frac{2p}{q}} \left(\ln\left(\frac{(Tq)^k}{k\delta} \right) \right)^{-\frac{2kp}{q}} (kTq)^{\frac{2kp}{q}} \exp\left(2C_{R^\delta}^2 (T-t)^2 \right) \left\| u_T^\delta - v_T^\delta \right\|^2.$$

Hence, we conclude that

$$\left\| u^\delta(t) - v^\delta(t) \right\| \leq \sqrt{2}\delta^{\frac{p}{q}\left(\frac{t}{T}-1\right)} \left(\ln\left(\frac{(Tq)^k}{k\delta} \right) \right)^{-\frac{kp}{q}\left(1-\frac{t}{T}\right)} (kTq)^{\frac{kp}{q}\left(1-\frac{t}{T}\right)} \exp\left(C_{R^\delta}^2 (T-t)^2 \right) \left\| u_T^\delta - v_T^\delta \right\|.$$

This inequality follows the continuous dependence of the regularized solution (2.7) on u_T^δ, and the theorem is proved. □

We have completed the stability result, and we now can say that our constructed solution u^δ does uniquely exists by Lemma 7 and stable by Theorem 8. It remains to prove the convergence coupled with the rate. The effective strategy is employing the approximate solution corresponding to the exact data where we denote by U^δ. Generally speaking, the solution U^δ enables us, by the triangle inequality, to deduce the main part of finding error estimate to the exact solution u. Furthermore, as we know well, the current tackled problem is widely general while our functional space in hands is strictly limited, says $C([0,T];\mathcal{H})$ at most. Therefore, the next challenge lies in not only we have to find an abstract space in such a way that it is capable of covering our analysis, but also requires many efforts in computation. As a consequence, the Gevrey regularity, as has been fully introduced, will take place in our main results. The appearance of this regularity is remarkably a concrete evidence for the difficulty of nonlinear problems backward in time.

Theorem 9. *Suppose that the solution u given by (2.3) of the problem (1.1) belongs to $C([0,T];\mathbb{G}_\sigma^\gamma)$ for $\sigma \geq Tq$ and $\gamma = 2k$. Then for $\delta \in (0,1)$, the error estimate over the space $\mathcal{H}$ between u and the functional U^δ defined by*

$$U^\delta(t) = \int_0^\infty \Phi_{\bar{\mu},\lambda}^\delta(T,t)\, dE_\lambda u_T - \int_t^T \int_0^\infty \Phi_{\bar{\mu},\lambda}^\delta(s,t)\, dE_\lambda f_{R^\delta}\left(s, U^\delta\right) ds, \tag{3.3}$$

is uniformly given by

$$\left\| u(t) - U^\delta(t) \right\| \leq \sqrt{2}\delta^{\frac{p(t-T)}{qT}+1} \left(\ln\left(\frac{(Tq)^k}{k\delta} \right) \right)^{-\frac{kp(T-t)}{qT}} (kTq)^{\frac{kp(T-t)}{qT}} \|u\|_{C\left([0,T];\mathbb{G}_\sigma^\gamma\right)} exp\left(C_{R^\delta}^2 (T-t)^2 \right).$$

Proof. Observe (2.3) and (3.3), they can be rewritten as

$$u(t) = \int_0^\infty e^{\bar{\mu}(0,T)\lambda} \left(e^{-\bar{\mu}(0,t)\lambda} dE_\lambda u_T - \int_t^T e^{(\bar{\mu}(t,s)-\bar{\mu}(0,T))\lambda} dE_\lambda f(s,u)\, ds \right), \tag{3.4}$$

$$U^\delta(t) = \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{\delta\lambda^k + e^{-\bar{\mu}(0,T)\lambda}} \left(e^{-\bar{\mu}(0,t)\lambda} dE_\lambda u_T - \int_t^T e^{(\bar{\mu}(t,s)-\bar{\mu}(0,T))\lambda} dE_\lambda f_{R^\delta}\left(s, U^\delta\right) ds \right). \tag{3.5}$$

Therefore, putting $d^{\delta}(t)=u(t)-U^{\delta}(t)$ one deduces from (3.4) and (3.5) that

$$\begin{aligned}
d^{\delta}(t) &= \int_0^{\infty}\left(e^{\bar{\mu}(0,T)\lambda}-\frac{1}{\delta\lambda^k+e^{-\bar{\mu}(0,T)\lambda}}\right)\left(e^{-\bar{\mu}(0,t)\lambda}dE_\lambda u_T-\int_t^T e^{(\bar{\mu}(t,s)-\bar{\mu}(0,T))\lambda}dE_\lambda f(s,u)\,ds\right)\\
&\quad+\int_t^T\int_0^{\infty}\Phi^{\delta}_{\bar{\mu},\lambda}(s,t)\,dE_\lambda\left(f_{R^\delta}\left(s,U^{\delta}\right)-f(s,u)\right)ds\\
&= \int_0^{\infty}\delta\lambda^k\Phi^{\delta}_{\bar{\mu},\lambda}(T,t)\left(e^{\bar{\mu}(0,T)\lambda}dE_\lambda u_T-\int_t^T\int_0^{\infty}e^{\bar{\mu}(0,s)\lambda}dE_\lambda f(s,u)\right)\\
&\quad+\int_t^T\int_0^{\infty}\Phi^{\delta}_{\bar{\mu},\lambda}(s,t)\,dE_\lambda\left(f_{R^\delta}\left(s,U^{\delta}\right)-f(s,u)\right)ds\\
&= \int_0^{\infty}\delta\lambda^k\Phi^{\delta}_{\bar{\mu},\lambda}(T,t)\,e^{\bar{\mu}(0,t)\lambda}dE_\lambda u(t)+\int_t^T\int_0^{\infty}\Phi^{\delta}_{\bar{\mu},\lambda}(s,t)\,dE_\lambda\left(f_{R^\delta}\left(s,U^{\delta}\right)-f(s,u)\right)ds.
\end{aligned}$$

Thanks to Lemma 5, we thus have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left|d^{\delta}(t)\right| &\leq (kTq)^{\frac{kp(T-t)}{qT}}\,\delta^{\frac{p(t-T)}{qT}+1}\left(\ln\left(\frac{(Tq)^k}{k\delta}\right)\right)^{-\frac{kp(T-t)}{qT}}\int_0^{\infty}\lambda^k e^{\bar{\mu}(0,t)\lambda}d\left|E_\lambda u(t)\right|\\
&\quad+(kTq)^{\frac{kp(s-t)}{qT}}\int_t^T\int_0^{\infty}\delta^{\frac{p(t-s)}{qT}}\left(\ln\left(\frac{(Tq)^k}{k\delta}\right)\right)^{-\frac{kp(s-t)}{qT}}d\left|E_\lambda\left(f_{R^\delta}\left(s,U^{\delta}\right)-f(s,u)\right)\right|ds.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (A_2) shows that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\delta^{-\frac{2pt}{qT}}\left(\ln\left(\frac{(Tq)}{k\delta}\right)\right)^{-\frac{2kpt}{qT}}(kTq)^{\frac{2kpt}{qT}}\left\|d^{\delta}(t)\right\|^2\leq 2\delta^{2\left(1-\frac{p}{q}\right)}(kTq)^{\frac{2kp}{q}}\left(\ln\left(\frac{(Tq)^k}{k\delta}\right)\right)^{-\frac{2kp}{q}}\|u\|^2_{C\left([0,T];\mathbb{G}^{\gamma}_{\sigma}\right)}+\\
&\qquad+2(T-t)\int_t^T\delta^{-\frac{2ps}{qT}}(kTq)^{\frac{2kps}{qT}}\left(\ln\left(\frac{(Tq)}{k\delta}\right)\right)^{-\frac{2kps}{qT}}\left\|f_{R^\delta}\left(s,U^{\delta}\right)-f(s,u)\right\|^2ds. \qquad (3.6)
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the inequality $(a+b)^2\leq 2(a^2+b^2)$ and Hölder's inequality, and multiplied both sides of the inequality by $\delta^{-\frac{2pt}{qT}}\left(\ln\left(\frac{(Tq)}{k\delta}\right)\right)^{-\frac{2kpt}{qT}}(kTq)^{\frac{2kpt}{qT}}$.

Notice from the fact that $\lim_{\delta\to 0^+}R^{\delta}=\infty$, one has, by the idea of [21], there exists $\delta_0>0$ such that $f(t,u)=f_{R^\delta}(t,u)$ for all $\delta\in(0,\delta_0)$. Using this fact in combination with the globally Lipschitz condition by (2.5), it thus follows from (3.6) that

$$w^2(t)\leq 2\delta^{2\left(1-\frac{p}{q}\right)}(kTq)^{\frac{2kp}{q}}\left(\ln\left(\frac{(Tq)^k}{k\delta}\right)\right)^{-\frac{2kp}{q}}\|u\|^2_{\mathbb{G}^{\gamma}_{\sigma}}+2(T-t)C^2_{R^\delta}\int_t^T w^2(s)\,ds, \qquad (3.7)$$

where we have putted

$$w(t)=\delta^{-\frac{pt}{qT}}\left(\ln\left(\frac{(Tq)}{k\delta}\right)\right)^{-\frac{kpt}{qT}}(kTq)^{\frac{2kpt}{qT}}\left\|d^{\delta}(t)\right\|.$$

So now, it is clear that applying Grönwall's inequality to (3.7) gives us

$$w^2(t)\leq 2\delta^{2\left(1-\frac{p}{q}\right)}(kTq)^{\frac{2kp}{q}}\left(\ln\left(\frac{(Tq)^k}{k\delta}\right)\right)^{-\frac{2kp}{q}}\|u\|^2_{C\left([0,T];\mathbb{G}^{\gamma}_{\sigma}\right)}\exp\left(2C^2_{R^\delta}(T-t)^2\right).$$

Hence, we obtain

$$\left\|d^{\delta}(t)\right\| \leq \sqrt{2}\delta^{\frac{p(t-T)}{qT}+1}\left(\ln\left(\frac{(Tq)^{k}}{k\delta}\right)\right)^{-\frac{kp(T-t)}{qT}}(kTq)^{\frac{kp(T-t)}{qT}}\left\|u\right\|_{C\left([0,T];\mathbb{G}_{\sigma}^{\gamma}\right)}\exp\left(C_{R^{\delta}}^{2}(T-t)^{2}\right),$$

which leads to the result of the theorem. □

Theorem 10. *Assume that the solution u given by (2.3) of the problem (1.1) has the same regularity in Theorem 9. Then for $\delta \in (0,1)$, the error estimate over the space $\mathcal{H}$ between the functional u^{δ} in (2.7), and the exact solution u is uniformly given by*

$$\left\|u(t)-u^{\delta}(t)\right\| \leq C_{T}\delta^{\frac{p}{q}\left(\frac{t}{T}-1\right)+1}\left(\ln\left(\frac{(Tq)^{k}}{k\delta}\right)\right)^{-\frac{kp}{q}\left(1-\frac{t}{T}\right)}(kTq)^{\frac{kp}{q}\left(1-\frac{t}{T}\right)}exp\left(C_{R^{\delta}}^{2}(T-t)^{2}\right),$$

where C_T is a generic positive constant depending only on T.

Proof. Due to Theorem 8-9 and the assumption (A_3), the proof is straightforward. Indeed, using the triangle inequality we have the following estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|u(t)-u^{\delta}(t)\right\| &\leq \left\|u(t)-U^{\delta}(t)\right\|+\left\|U^{\delta}(t)-u^{\delta}(t)\right\| \\
&\leq \sqrt{2}\delta^{\frac{p(t-T)}{qT}+1}\left(\ln\left(\frac{(Tq)^{k}}{k\delta}\right)\right)^{-\frac{kp(T-t)}{qT}}(kTq)^{\frac{kp(T-t)}{qT}}\left\|u\right\|_{C\left([0,T];\mathbb{G}_{\sigma}^{\gamma}\right)}\exp\left(C_{R^{\delta}}^{2}(T-t)^{2}\right) \\
&\quad +\sqrt{2}\delta^{\frac{p}{q}\left(\frac{t}{T}-1\right)}\left(\ln\left(\frac{(Tq)^{k}}{k\delta}\right)\right)^{-\frac{kp}{q}\left(1-\frac{t}{T}\right)}(kTq)^{\frac{kp}{q}\left(1-\frac{t}{T}\right)}\exp\left(C_{R^{\delta}}^{2}(T-t)^{2}\right)\left\|u_{T}^{\delta}-u_{T}\right\| \\
&\leq \sqrt{2}\delta^{\frac{p}{q}\left(\frac{t}{T}-1\right)+1}\left(\ln\left(\frac{(Tq)^{k}}{k\delta}\right)\right)^{-\frac{kp}{q}\left(1-\frac{t}{T}\right)}(kTq)^{\frac{kp}{q}\left(1-\frac{t}{T}\right)}\exp\left(C_{R^{\delta}}^{2}(T-t)^{2}\right)\left(1+\left\|u\right\|_{C\left([0,T];\mathbb{G}_{\sigma}^{\gamma}\right)}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

So our objective is well-accomplished. This completes the proof of the theorem. □

Remark 11. Let us now sum up what we have obtained in Lemma 7 and Theorem 8-10. In principle, comparing our stability estimate with previous works, it is better or rather general than the previous orders, *e.g.* in [5, 7, 14, 20, 23, 27]. As might be expected, the order of the stability here is $\delta^{\frac{p}{q}\left(\frac{t}{T}-1\right)}\left(\ln\left(\frac{(Tq)^{k}}{k\delta}\right)\right)^{-\frac{kp}{q}\left(1-\frac{t}{T}\right)}$ containing the result in [6, Theorem 2] where $p=q=1$ are treated.

Furthermore, the modified quasi-boundary value method has also been proved that it is beneficial if one considers the error estimate in the original time $t=0$. More rigorously, the result in Theorem 10 says that

$$\left\|u(0)-u^{\delta}(0)\right\| \leq C_{T}\delta^{1-\frac{p}{q}}\left(\ln\left(\frac{(Tq)^{k}}{k\delta}\right)\right)^{-\frac{kp}{q}}(kTq)^{\frac{kp}{q}}\exp\left(C_{R^{\delta}}^{2}T^{2}\right).$$

It is thus evident to claim that the modified quasi-boundary value proposed here, in general, not only gives a sharp and better approximation than many well-known methods such as quasi-reversibility studied in [14], stabilized quasi-reversibility in [21] and quasi-boundary value investigated in [5, 7, 19], but also proves the applicability of the method to a wide range of nonlinear parabolic equations.

Remark 12. It is worth noting that if the nonlinear source term $f(\cdot,u)$ and initial data $u(0)$ belong to the space $L^{2}(0,T;\mathbb{G}_{\sigma}^{\gamma})$ and $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}^{\gamma})$ for $\sigma \geq Tq$ and $\gamma = 2k$, respectively, we then obtain the same error estimate in Theorem 10. Additionally, it is comprehensive that we may assume $\gamma \geq 2k$ if $\lambda \geq 1$.

Moreover, it can be proved in Theorem 10 that if further assume that $u \in C\left([0,T];\mathbb{G}^{\gamma}_{\sigma'} \cap \mathbb{G}^{\gamma}_{\sigma}\right)$ for $\sigma' = Tp$ and $p < q$, the error can be extremely rigorously estimated in the sense that

$$C_1 \delta^{\frac{p}{q}\left(\frac{t}{T}-1\right)+1} \left(\ln\left(\frac{(Tq)^k}{k\delta}\right)\right)^{-\frac{kp}{q}\left(1-\frac{t}{T}\right)} \leq \left\|u(t) - u^{\delta}(t)\right\| \leq C_2 \delta^{\frac{p}{q}\left(\frac{t}{T}-1\right)+1} \left(\ln\left(\frac{(Tq)^k}{k\delta}\right)\right)^{-\frac{kp}{q}\left(1-\frac{t}{T}\right)},$$

in which $C_1 = C\left(k, p, q, T, \|u\|_{C\left([0,T];\mathbb{G}^{\gamma}_{\sigma'}\right)}\right)$ and $C_2 = C\left(k, p, q, T, R^{\delta}, \|u\|_{C\left([0,T];\mathbb{G}^{\gamma}_{\sigma}\right)}\right)$.

4. Conclusions and future challenges

This is the moment to briefly review what we have done in this paper and what remains to be done.

We have generalized the framework to the certain modified quasi-boundary value method, and applied it to approximate the abstract backward parabolic problem with time-dependent coefficients and local Lipschitzian source. Under Gevrey regularity on the true solution, theoretical considerations claim that our method is stable in $\mathcal{H}$ for every noise level and uniformly convergent in $\mathbb{G}^{\gamma}_{\sigma}$. The error estimate exhibits a faster (or rather general) rate than the quasi-reversibility method and the quasi-boundary value method with their modified versions. Furthermore, the error at the original point is highly valuable. This work is an improvement for the results obtained in, for example, [6, 7, 24, 27].

Bearing in mind the monumental intellectual effort that went into the last two decades of developing regularization methods, it would have been surprising that we have been able to analyze in a considerably more complicated framework. Nevertheless, much further investigation, as we now indicate, is required. We thus wish to single out other problems and challenges for future work. These include:

(1) The local Lipschitzian source is obviously general, but in many biological situations, nonlocal effects (*e.g.* local movement of species) are coupled with long-range influences, i.e. nonlinear partial integro-differential equations must be considered. In physics, the well-known viscous Burgers' equation had a very long history of establishment and development in the studies of fluid mechanics and other related ramifications. Even though this equation can be converted to the linear heat equation by the Hopf-Cole transformation, it is more interesting to attack on the original equation. In principle, it needs to take into consideration the more realistic equation:

$$\partial_t u - \mu\left(t, x, u, \int_{\Omega} u dx\right) \Delta u = f\left(t, x, u, \nabla u, \int_{\Omega} u dx\right).$$

(2) It seems that we may find a filtering function to obtain the regularized problem. However, we have yet to see how well it works on a specific model such as reaction-diffusion systems for two (or larger) species. Besides, constructing a new truncated function in this case is a huge challenge.

(3) The initial-boundary value problem of a semi-linear parabolic equation is somehow blow-up in finite time. It is either the intention or the message to challenge ourselves this question for the backward problem. All we need here is precisely providing the relevant theoretical details and asymptotic behavior.

(4) Another theoretical issue must be properly addressed stems from facing a model with a periodically perforated domain which is getting more attention in homogenization field in recent years. It is well-known that there exists a family of eigenvectors and a corresponding family of eigenvalues which have almost the same fundamental properties with the ones in the common eigenvalue problem. In particular, those eigenvectors are an orthonormal basis in L^2 over the considered perforated domain, and their eigenvectors are increasing and tend to infinity in a weak sense. For more details, the reader can be referred to [4, Section 3.3]. As a consequence, a better understanding of how to treat this problem is needed.

(5) Concerning numerical issues, currently there is no rigorously numerical analysis and treatment for computing the mild solution (attached by the truncated function) even if it is typically linear. In the simple case where eigenelements are explicitly known, one may try to use the Filon method or many improvements/approaches (exotic quadrature, Birkhoff expansions,...) to treat the highly oscillatory integrals in the Fourier coefficients. However, among dozens of methods, we need a great analyzing comparison. Since the backward problem is extremely sensitive, we are not sure whether the ill-conditioned numerical problem happens or not.

(6) Computing the problem is, in general, expensive, and the cost is bigger and bigger while solving with multiple dimensions. Consequently, efficient algorithms in combination with parallel computing need to be developed. On the other hand, it is not clear how errors associated with approximating the mild solution would impact the stability of the regularized problem of interest here. Recall that the filtering function has "dangerous" factors, ones increase so fast while the others reduces exponentially. This may exacerbate such errors.

Acknowledgement. The author would like to give many thanks to Dr. Nguyen Huy Tuan for the wholehearted guidance when the author was studying at Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, Ho Chi Minh City University of Science, Vietnam. The paper is also observed as his deep gratitude to Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, Eindhoven University of Technology in The Netherlands. Their hospitality is gratefully acknowledged. He wishes to thank the handling editor as well as anonymous referees for their most helpful comments on this paper.

References

[1] J.V. Beck, B. Blackwell, and C.R. St. Clair. *Inverse Heat Conduction: Ill-posed Problems*. Wiley–Interscience, 1985.

[2] N. Boussetila and F. Rebbani. A modified quasi-reversibility method for a class of ill-posed Cauchy problems. *Georgian Mathematical Journal*, 14(4):627–642, 2007.

[3] C. Cao, M.A. Rammaha, and E.S. Titi. The Navier-Stokes equations on the rotating 2-D sphere: Gevrey regularity and asymptotic degrees of freedom. *Z. Angew. Math. Phys.*, 50:341–360, 1999.

[4] D. Cioranescu and J.S. Jean Paulin. *Homogenization of Reticulated Structures*. Springer, 1999.

[5] G.W. Clark and S.F. Oppenheimer. Quasireversibility methods for non-well-posed problems. *Electronic Journal of Differential Equations*, 1994(8):1–9, 1994.

[6] M. Denche and A. Abdessemed. On regularization and error estimates for non-homogeneous backward Cauchy problem. *Arab Journal of Mathematical Sciences*, 18:149–164, 2012.

[7] M. Denche and K. Bessila. A modified quasi-boundary value method for ill-posed problems. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 301:419–426, 2005.

[8] R.A. Fisher. The wave of advance of advantageous genes. *Annals of Eugenics*, 7:355–369, 1937.

[9] J. Hadamard. *Lectures on Cauchy problem in linear partial differential equations*. Yale University Press, New Haven, 1923.

[10] D.N. Hào, N.V. Duc, and H. Sahli. A non-local boundary value problem method for parabolic equations backward in time. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 345:805–815, 2008.

[11] M.S. Hussein and D. Lesnic. Determination of a time-dependent thermal diffusivity and free boundary in heat conduction. *International Communications in Heat and Mass Transfer*, 53:154–163, 2014.

[12] M.S. Hussein and D. Lesnic. Identification of the time-dependent conductivity of an inhomogeneous diffusive material. *Applied Mathematics and Computation*, 269:35–58, 2015.

[13] L.L. Latour, P.P. Mitra, R.L. Kleinberg, and C.H. Sotak. Time-dependent diffusion coefficient of fluids in porous media as a probe of surface-to-volume ratio. *Journal of Magnetic Resonance. Series A*, 101:342–346, 1993.

[14] R. Lattés and J.L. Lions. *Méthode de Quasi-réversibilité et Applications*. Dunod, Paris, 1967.

[15] J. Nagumo, S. Yoshizawa, and S. Arimoto. Bistable transmission lines. *IEEE Trans. Circuit Theory*, 12:400–412, 1965.

[16] A.C. Newell and J.A. Whitehead. Finite bandwidth, finite amplitude convection. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, 38:279–303, 1969.

[17] A. Pazy. *Semigroups of Linear Operators and Application to Partial Differential Equations*. Springer-Verlag, 1983.

[18] T.I. Seidman. Optimal filtering for the backward heat equation. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 33(1):162–170, 1996.
[19] R.E. Showalter. Cauchy problem for hyper-parabolic partial differential equations. In *Trends in the Theory and Practice of Non-Linear Analysis*. Elsevier, 1983.
[20] L.M. Triet, P.H. Quan, D.D. Trong, and N.H. Tuan. A backward parabolic equation with a time-dependent coefficient: Regularization and error estimates. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, 237:432–441, 2013.
[21] D.D. Trong, B.T. Duy, and M.N. Minh. Backward heat equations with locally Lipschitz source. *Applicable Analysis: An International Journal*, 94(10):2023–2036, 2015.
[22] D.D. Trong and N.H. Tuan. A nonhomogeneous backward heat problem: Regularization and error estimates. *Electronic Journal of Differential Equations*, 2008(33):1–14, 2008.
[23] N.H. Tuan, T.T. Binh, N.D. Minh, and T.T. Nghia. An improved regularization method for initial inverse problem in 2-D heat equation. *Applied Mathematical Modelling*, 39(2):425–437, 2015.
[24] N.H. Tuan, B.T. Duy, N.D. Minh, and V.A. Khoa. Hölder stability for a class of initial inverse nonlinear heat problem in multiple dimension. *Communications in Nonlinear Science and Numerical Simulation*, 23(1–3):89–114, 2015.
[25] N.H. Tuan and P.H. Quan. Some extended results on a nonlinear ill-posed heat equation and remarks on a general case of nonlinear terms. *Nonlinear Analysis: Real World Applications*, 12:2973–2984, 2011.
[26] N.H. Tuan, P.H. Quan, D.D. Trong, and L.M. Triet. On a backward heat problem with time-dependent coefficient: Regularization and error estimates. *Applied Mathematics and Computation*, 219:6066–6073, 2013.
[27] N.H. Tuan and D.D. Trong. On a backward Cauchy problem associated with continuous spectrum operator. *Nonlinear Analysis*, 73:1966–1972, 2010.
[28] N.H. Tuan and D.D. Trong. On a backward parabolic problem with local lipschitz source. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 414:678–692, 2014.
[29] C.-Y. Yang. Estimation of the temperature-dependent thermal conductivity in inverse heat conduction problems. *Applied Mathematical Modelling*, 23:469–478, 1999.
[30] Y.B. Zeldovich. Theory of flame propagation, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics Tehcnical Memorandum. *Translation of: Zh. Fiz. Khim.*, 22:27–49, 1948.
[31] Z. Zhang, D.L. Johnson, and L.M. Schwartz. Simulating the time-dependent diffusion coefficient in mixed-pore-size materials. *Physical Review E*, 84, 2011. 031129.

Mathematics and Computer Science Division, Gran Sasso Science Institute, Viale Francesco Crispi 7, 67100 L'Aquila, Italy
E-mail address: khoa.vo@gssi.infn.it, vakhoa.hcmus@gmail.com